ATTORNEY OF PARTYUNITIES	PLD-PI-001
ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State Bar number, and address): Lawrance A. Bohm (SBN: 208716)	FOR COURT USE ONLY
BOHM LAW GROUP	
4600 Northgate Boulevard, Suite 210	
Sacramento, California 95834	
TELEPHONE NO: 916.927.5574 FAX NO. (Optional): 916.927.2046	
E-MAIL ADDRESS (Optional):	
ATTORNEY FOR (Name): Plaintiff, FRANCES BRANCH	
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO	
STREET ADDRESS: 720 NINTH STREET	
MAILING ADDRESS: SAME	
CITY AND ZIP CODE: SACRAMENTO, CA 95814	
DRAWGUNUS Conday D. C. 1. 1. D. C. 1. D. C. 1. 1. D. C. 1. D. C. 1. 1. D. C. 1. 1. D. C. 1. D. D. C. 1. D. C. 1. D.	
BRANCH NAME: Gordon D. Schaber Downtown Courthouse	
PLAINTIFF: FRANCES BRANCH	(9/5)
	A CA
DEFENDANT: THE PERMANENTE MEDICAL GROUP, Inc., and	13
DOES 1 TO 25, inclusive.	(20 10)
COMPLAINT—Personal Injury, Property Damage, Wrongful Death	D V Z
AMENDED (Number):	THE PARTY OF THE P
Type (check all that apply):	1 39/
~ /	(I)
MOTOR VEHICLE OTHER (specify): EMPLOYMENT Property Damage Wrongful Death	
Personal Injury Other Damages (specify): EMPLOYMENT Jurisdiction (check all that apply):	
ACTION IS A LIMITED CIVIL CASE	CASE NUMBER:
Amount demanded does not exceed \$10,000	1
exceeds \$10,000, but does not exceed \$25,000	
ACTION IS AN UNLIMITED CIVIL CASE (exceeds \$25,000)	
ACTION IS RECLASSIFIED by this amended complaint	
from limited to unlimited	1
from unlimited to limited	
1. Plaintiff (name or names): FRANCES BRANCH	
alleges causes of action against defendant (name or names):	
THE PERMANENTE MEDICAL GROUP, INC., and DOES 1 through 25.	
2. This pleading, including attachments and exhibits, consists of the following number of page:	s: Thirteen (13)
Each plaintiff named above is a competent adult	\ - /
a. except plaintiff (name):	
(1) a corporation qualified to do business in California	
(2) an unincorporated entity (describe):	
(3) a public entity (describe):	
(4) aminor an adult	
(a) for whom a guardian or conservator of the estate or a guardian	and litem has been appointed
(b) other (specify):	rad mem has been appointed
(5) other (specify):	
b. except plaintiff (name):	
(1) a corporation qualified to do business in California	
(2) an unincorporated entity (describe):	
(3) a public entity (describe):	
(4) a minor an adult	
5 The second of the column of a guardial	ad litem has been appointed
(b) other (specify):	
(5) other (specify):	
Information about a fifth 1 1 1 100	
Information about additional plaintiffs who are not competent adults is shown in Attachr	ment 3.

Γ	SHORT TITLE:	PLD-PI-001
		CASE NUMBER:
	BRANCH v. THE PERMANENTE MEDICAL GROUP, INC.; et al.	
_		
4.	Transit (ramo).	
	is doing business under the fictitious name (specify):	
_	and has complied with the fictitious business name laws.	
5.	Each defendant named above is a natural person	
	a. very except defendant (name): TPMG, Inc.	ant (name):
	(1) a business organization, form unknown (1) a business	siness organization, form unknown
	(3) an unincorporated antity (denset)	poration
	(3) an unincorporated entity (describe):	nincorporated entity (describe):
	(4) a public entity (describe):	
	(4) a public entity (describe):	olic entity (describe):
	(5) other (specify):	. ~ () >
	(5) other	(specify);
		<i>(</i>)
	b. except defendant (name): d. except defenda	int (name):
	(1) a business organization, form unknown (1) a bus	iness organization, form unknown
	(=) La sorporation	poration
		incorporated entity (describe):
	(4) a public antity (describe)	
	(4) a public entity (describe):	lic entity (describe):
	(5) other (specify):	(and alf de
	(o) Light other	(specify):
	Information at a task to the second	
	Information about additional defendants who are not natural persons is contained in	Attachment 5.
3.	The true names of defendants sued as Does are unknown to plaintiff.	
	a. Doe defendants (specify Doe numbers). 1 through 10, inclusive were t	he agents or employees of other
	that agency or employment,	no agonto di diripioyees di diriei
	b. Doe defendants (specify Doe numbers): 11 through 25, inclusive are per	sons whose capacities are unknown to
,		
7.	Defendants who are joined under Code of Civil Procedure section 382 are (names):	
3.	This court is the proper court because	
	a. at least one defendant now resides in its jurisdictional area.	
	b. the principal place of business of a defendant corporation or unincorporated asset	mainstrum to the service of the service of
	c. injury to person or damage to personal property occurred in its jurisdictional area	ociation is in its jurisdictional area.
	a. vi other (specify):	
	Plaintiff was employed as a Registered Nurse by Defendant The P	ermanenta Madical Communication
	dou reason i chilanelle, at its Adult Advice (311 Center located at	2200 Andon 337 C
	V2 - 75045, and this pholicas location is within the introductional a	rea of this court
	- I remain to required to comply with a cialling statute, and	ca of this court.
	a. A has complied with applicable claims statutes, or	
	b. is excused from complying because (specify):	
	Plaintiff filed a timely complaint with the California Department of	f Fair Employment and Housing
	\ \times \ \	exhaust her claims under the
	provisions of the Fair Employment and Housing Act ("FEHA").	

SHORT TITLE:	PLD-PI-00
BRANCH v. THE PERMANENTE MEDICAL GROUP, INC.; et al.	CASE NUMBER:
 10. The following causes of action are attached and the statements above apply to eac causes of action attached): a. Motor Vehicle b. General Negligence c. Intentional Tort d. Products Liability e. Premises Liability f. Other (specify): 	ch (each complaint must have one or more
Disability & Age Discrimination; CFRA & FEHA Retaliation and Retaliation; Failure to Provide Reasonable Accommodate Interactive Process; Defamation; and Wrongful Termination	
a. wage loss b. loss of use of property c. hospital and medical expenses d. general damage e. property damage f. loss of earning capacity g. other damage (specify):	
Physical pain, mental suffering, loss of enjoyment of life, physicif, anxiety, humiliation, and emotional distress.	sical impairment, inconvenience,
12. The damages claimed for wrongful death and the relationships of plaintiff to the a. listed in Attachment 12. b. as follows:	deceased are
13. The relief sought in this complaint is within the jurisdiction of this court.	
14. Plaintiff prays or judgment for costs of suit; for such relief as is fair, just, and equitable a. (1) compensatory damages (2) punitive damages The amount of damages is (in cases for personal injury or wrongful death, you must (1) according to proof (2) in the amount of: \$	
5. The paragraphs of this complaint alleged on information and belief are as follows	(specify paragraph asset)
As to all paragraphs.	(specify paragraph numbers):
Pate: October 14, 2014	
Lawrance A. Bohm, Esq.	166/
(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)	NATURE OF PLAINTIFF OR ATTORNEY)
D-PI-001 [Rev. January 1, 2007] COMPLAINT—Personal Injury Fromerty	

SHORT TITLE: BRANCH v. THE PERMANENTE MEDICAL GROUP, INC.; et al.	CASE NUMBER:	<u>25</u>
ATTACHMENT (Number):	1	

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION – Disability Discrimination (Government Code section 12940, subdivision (a))

- 1. At all times relevant to this matter, Plaintiff Frances Branch (hereafter "PLAINTIFF") suffered from a "physical disability" as defined by Government Code section 12926, subdivision (k) and California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 7293.6, subdivision (e). In spite of her disability, PLAINTIFF was able to perform the essential functions of her position as defined by Government Code section 12926, subdivision (f) and California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 7293.8, subdivision (g) and was otherwise able to perform her accommodation required by Government Code section 12926, subdivision (n) and California Code of Regulations, title 2, subdivision 7293.9, subdivision (a).
- 2. DEFENDANT's conduct violated Government Code section 12940, subdivision (a) consistent with California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 7293.7. Specifically, DEFENDANT denied PLAINTIFF reasonable accommodations by terminating PLAINTIFF when she exercised her right to take medical leave pursuant to the federal Family and Medical Leave Act (29 U.S.C. § 2601, et seq.) and/or the California Family Rights Act (Gov. Code § 12945.2). DEFENDANT did so despite PLAINTIFF's experience in her job and knowledge she could perform the duties of the position.
- 3. DEFENDANT's discriminatory conduct was a substantial factor causing PLAINTIFF to suffer economic damages and non-economic damages in excess of this Court's jurisdiction according to proof at trial.
- 4. As an actual and proximate result of the aforementioned violations, PLAINTIFF has been damaged in an amount according to proof, but in an amount in excess of the jurisdiction of this Court. PLAINTIFF also seeks "affirmative relief" or "prospective relief" as defined by Government Code section 12926, subdivision (a).
- 5. The above-described actions were perpetrated and/or ratified by a managing agent(s) or officer(s) of DEFENDANT. These acts were done with malice, fraud, oppression, and in reckless disregard of PLAINTIFF's rights. Further, said actions were despicable in character and warrant the imposition of punitive damages in a sum sufficient to punish and deter DEFENDANT's future conduct.

WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF prays for judgment as hereinafter set forth.

(If the item that this Attachment concerns is made under penalty of perjury, all statements in this Attachment are made under penalty of perjury.)

Page 1 of 10 (Add pages as required)

SHORT TITLE:	MC-0
BRANCH v. THE PERMANENTE MEDICAL GROUP, INC.; et al.	CASE NUMBER:
ATTACHMENT (Number):	2
(This Attachment may be used with any Judicial Co.	mail farms
SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION – Age Discrimination (Government Coo	de section 12940 subdivision (a)
6. PLAINTIFF incorporates the allegations contained in the	125 to, subdivision (a))
6. PLAINTIFF incorporates the allegations contained in the above paragra	phs as though fully set forth herein.
7. At all times relevant to this matter, PLAINTIFF was a woman over the a Code section 12926, subdivision (b) and California Code of Regulations, timember of a class of persons protected by the California Fair Employment employment discrimination based on her age.	age of 40 as defined by Government itle 2, section 7295.0, and thus is a and Housing Act ("FEHA") from
8. DEFENDANT knew that PLAINTIFF was above the age of 40 as define 12926, subdivision (b) and California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 7	ed by Government Code section 7295.0.
9. DEFENDANT discriminated against PLAINTIFF in violation of Govern subdivision (a) and consistent with California Code of Regulations, title 2, PLAINTIFF's employment; thereby, 2) forcing PLAINTIFF into early retird discriminating against PLAINTIFF with regard to the terms and conditions age.	ment Code section 12940, section 7295.0, by: 1) terminating
10. As a proximate result of the aforementioned violations, PLAINTIFF has according to proof, but in an amount in excess of the jurisdiction of this Cou "affirmative relief" or "prospective relief" as defined by Government Code s	been damaged in an amount ort. PLAINTIFF also seeks section12926, subdivision (a).
11. The above-described actions were perpetrated and/or ratified by a management of DEFENDANT. These acts were done with malice, fraud, oppression, and in PLAINTIFF's rights. Further, said actions were despicable in character and damages in a sum sufficient to punish and deter DEFENDANT's future conditions.	ging agent(s) or officer(s) of a reckless disregard of
WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF prays for judgment as hereinafter set forth.	

(If the item that this Attachment concerns is made under penalty of perjury, all statements in this Attachment are made under penalty of perjury.)

Page _ 2 _ of _ 10

SHORT TITLE: BRANCH v. THE PERMANENTE MEDICAL GROUP, INC.; et al.	CASE NUMBER:
ATTACHMENT (Number):	3

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION - California Family Rights Act Retaliation (Government Code section 12945.2, subdivision (1)1)

- 12. PLAINTIFF incorporates the allegations contained in the above paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.
- 13. At all times relevant to this action, the California Family Rights Act ("CFRA") and California Government Code section 12940, et. seq. were in full force and effect, and binding on DEFENDANT DEFENDANT's statements and conduct represent a violation of CFRA, specifically, California Government Code section 12945.2, subdivision (1)1).
- 14. On or about September 5, 2013, PLAINTIFF took medical leave pursuant to the California Family Rights Act and Family Medical Leave Act. Pursuant to her physicians' recommendations, PLAINTIFF was scheduled to return to work October 15, 2013.
- 15. However, when PLAINTIFF reported to work on October 15, 2013, DEFENDANT terminated PLAINTIFF's employment.
- 16. The protected medical leave PLAINTIFF took and her complaints about having been denied promotions she had applied for, having been subjected to arbitrary and unwarranted disciplinary actions, and counseling and the work-related stress these situations had caused her were motivating reasons for DEFENDANT's decision to terminate PLAINTIFF. PLAINTIFF has lost income, business opportunities, and suffered severe emotional distress because of DEFENDANT's actions.
- 17. DEFENDANT's retaliatory and discriminatory conduct was a substantial factor causing PLAINTIFF to suffer economic damages and non-economic damages in excess of this court's jurisdiction according to proof
- 18. As a proximate result of the aforementioned violations, PLAINTIFF has been damaged in an amount according to proof, but in an amount in excess of the jurisdiction of this Court. PLAINTIFF also seeks "affirmative relief" or "prospective relief" as defined by Government Code section 12926, subdivision (a), including back pay, reimbursement of out of pocket expenses, expungement of records and any such other relief that this Court deems proper.
- 19. The above described actions were perpetrated and/or ratified by a managing agent(s) or officer(s) of DEFENDANT. These acts were done with malice, fraud, oppression, and in reckless disregard of PLAINTIFF's rights. Further, said actions were despicable in character and warrant the imposition of punitive damages in a sum sufficient to punish and deter DEFENDANT's future conduct.

WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF prays for judgment as hereinafter set forth.

If the item that this Attachment concerns is made under penalty of perjury, all statements in this Attachment are made under penalty of perjury.)

SHORT TITLE:	MC-025
BRANCH v. THE PERMANENTE MEDICAL GROUP, INC.; et al.	CASE MIMPED.
ATTACHMENT (Number):	4

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION - Retaliation (Government Code section 12940, subdivision (h))

- 20. PLAINTIFF incorporates the allegations contained in the above paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.
- 21. PLAINTIFF suffered from a "physical disability" as defined by Government Code section 12926, subdivision (k) and California Code of Regulations, title 2 section 7293.6, subdivision (d). PLAINTIFF was able to perform the essential functions of her position as defined by Government Code section 12926, subdivision (f) and California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 7293.6, subdivision (e).
- 22. PLAINTIFF (1) complained to managing agents of DEFENDANT that she should not suffer a loss of job responsibilities for having taken medical leave as described above, (2) provided timely notice to DEFENDANT of her need for medical leave, and, (3) had requested accommodation of a physical disability that was known to DEFENDANT. These activities are protected by the California Fair Employment and Housing Act. Accordingly, DEFENDANT 's conduct violated Government Code sections 12940, subdivision (h) and 12945.2, subdivision (l).
- 23. Adverse employment actions suffered by PLAINTIFF include, but are not limited to: (1) DEFENDANT failed to engage in the interactive process of accommodation in good faith; (2) DEFENDANT refused to allow her to resume her normal duties and terminated her employment immediately upon the conclusion of her physician-ordered medical leave of absence as described above; and (3) DEFENDANT otherwise retaliated against and discriminated against PLAINTIFF with regard to the terms and conditions of her employment because she engaged in activities protected by the California Fair Employment and Housing Act. DEFENDANT 's actions were motivated, at least in part, because PLAINTIFF engaged in protected activities.
- 24. DEFENDANT was motivated to retaliate because, among other things, PLAINTIFF asserted her right to take medical leave, requested accommodations related to her physical disabilities, and complained about having been denied promotions and having being subjected to unwarranted discipline. Accordingly, DEFENDANT's conduct violated Government Code section 12940, subdivision (h) and California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 7287.8.
- 25. DEFENDANT's discriminatory and retaliatory conduct was a substantial factor causing PLAINTIFF to suffer economic damages and non-economic damages in excess of this Court's jurisdiction according to proof at trial.
- 26. As an actual and proximate result of the aforementioned violations, PLAINTIFF has been damaged in an amount according to proof, but in an amount in excess of the jurisdiction of this Court. PLAINTIFF also seeks "affirmative relief" or "prospective relief" as defined by Government Code section 12926, subdivision (a).
- 27. The above described actions were perpetrated and/or ratified by a managing agent(s) or officer(s) of DEFENDANT. These acts were done with malice, fraud, oppression, and in reckless disregard of PLAINTIFF's rights. Further, said actions were despicable in character and warrant the imposition of punitive damages in a sum sufficient to punish and deter DEFENDANT 's future conduct.

WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF prays for judgment as hereinafter set forth.

the item that this Attachment concerns is made under penalty of perjury, all statements in the	
tachment are made under penalty of perjury.)	is

Page 4 of 10 (Add pages as required)

SHORT TITLE: BRANCH v. THE PERMANENTE MEDICAL GROUP, INC.; et al.	CASE NUMBER:	MC-025
ATTACHMENT (Number):	5	
(This Attachment may be used with any Judicial Cou	uncil form.)	

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION – Failure to Prevent Discrimination and Retaliation (Government Code section 12940, subdivision (k))

- 28. PLAINTIFF incorporates the allegations contained in the above paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.
- 29. DEFENDANT knew or should have known about the retaliation and disability discrimination committed against PLAINTIFF by managing agent(s) and/or officer(s) of Defendant as set forth above. Similarly, DEFENDANT knew or should have known that PLAINTIFF's disabilities had not been properly addressed. DEFENDANT failed to implement adequate training, policies or instructions that would have prevented the aforementioned discrimination, and retaliation. DEFENDANT breached its duty to prevent the above-described discrimination, and retaliation committed against PLAINTIFF Accordingly, DEFENDANT violated Government Code section 12940, subdivision (k).
- 30. DEFENDANT's discriminatory conduct was a substantial factor causing PLAINTIFF to suffer economic damages and non-economic damages in excess of this Court's jurisdiction according to proof at trial.
- 31. As an actual and proximate result of the aforementioned violations, PLAINTIFF has been damaged in an amount according to proof, but in an amount in excess of the jurisdiction of this Court. PLAINTIFF also seeks "affirmative relief" or "prospective relief" as defined by Government Code section 12926, subdivision (a).
- 32. The above-described actions were perpetrated and/or ratified by a managing agent(s) or officer(s) of DEFENDANT. These acts were done with malice, fraud, oppression, and in reckless disregard of PLAINTIFF's rights. Further, said actions were despicable in character and warrant the imposition of punitive damages in a sum sufficient to punish and deter DEFENDANT's future conduct.

WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF prays for judgment as hereinafter set forth.

(If the item that this Attachment concerns is made under penalty of perjury, all statements in this Attachment are made under penalty of perjury.)

Page __5 of __10

(Add pages as required)

www.courtinfo.ca.gov

SHORT TITLE:	CASE NUMBER: MC-025
BRANCH v. THE PERMANENTE MEDICAL GROUP, INC.; et al.	CASE NUMBER:

ATTACHMENT (Number): (This Attachment may be used with any Judicial Council form.)

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION - Failure to Provide Reasonable Accommodation (Government Code section 12940, subdivision (m))

- 33. PLAINTIFF incorporates the allegations contained in the above paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.
- 34. PLAINTIFF suffered from a "physical disability" as defined by Government Code section 12926, subdivision (l) and California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 7293.6, subdivision (d) PLAINTIFF was able to perform the essential functions of her position as defined by Government Code section 12926, subdivision (f) and California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 7293.6, subdivision (e) and was otherwise able to perform her job had DEFENDANT provided the reasonable accommodation required by Government Code section 12926, subdivision (n) and California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 7291.7.
- 35. DEFENDANT's conduct violated Government Code section 12940, subdivision (a) and was inconsistent with California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 7291.6, by: (1) terminating PLAINTIFF without consideration or in the alternative without regard to her physical disability, (2) terminating PLAINTIFF because she exercised her right to take medical leave pursuant to the federal Family and Medical Leave Act (29 U.S.C. § 2601, et seq.) and/or the California Family Rights Act Government Code section 12945.2); and, (3) otherwise discriminating against PLAINTIFF with regard to the terms and conditions of her employment because of her physical disability.
- 36. DEFENDANT cannot establish that allowing PLAINTIFF's accommodation was an "undue hardship" as defined by Government Code section 12926, subdivision (s) and California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 7293.9, subdivision (j). Accordingly, DEFENDANT's conduct violated Government Code section 12940, subdivision (m).
- 37. DEFENDANT's discriminatory conduct was a substantial factor causing PLAINTIFF to suffer economic damages and non-economic damages in excess of this court's jurisdiction according to proof at trial.
- 38. As an actual and proximate result of the aforementioned violations, PLAINTIFF has been damaged in an amount according to proof, but in an amount in excess of the jurisdiction of this Court. PLAINTIFF also seeks "affirmative relief" or "prospective relief" as defined by Government Code section 12926, subdivision (a).
- 39. The above-described actions were perpetrated and/or ratified by a managing agent(s) or officer(s) of DEFENDANT. These acts were done with malice, fraud, oppression, and in reckless disregard of PLAINTIFF's rights. Further, said actions were despicable in character and warrant the imposition of punitive damages in a sum sufficient to punish and deter DEFENDANT's future conduct.

WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF prays for judgment as hereinafter set forth.

(If the item that this Attachment concerns is made under penalty of perjury, all statements in this Attachment are made under penalty of perjury.)

Page 6 of 10

SHORT TITLE:	MC-025
BRANCH v. THE PERMANENTE MEDICAL GROUP, INC.; et al.	CASE NUMBER:
ATTACHMENT (Number):	7
(This Attachment may be used with any Judicial Co	ouncil form.)
SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION – Failure to Engage in Timely and (Government Code section 12940, subdiv	l Good Faith Interactive Process vision (n))
40. PLAINTIFF incorporates the allegations contained in the above paragraph	raphs as though fully set forth herein
41. PLAINTIFF suffered from a "physical disability" as defined by Gover subdivision (i) and California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 7293.6, disability, PLAINTIFF was able to perform the essential functions of her p Code section 12926, subdivision (f) and California Code of Regulations, ti and was otherwise able to perform her job had DEFENDANT provided the required by Government Code section 12926, subdivision (n) and Californ section 7293.9, subdivision (a).	nment Code section 12926, subdivision (f). In spite of her position as defined by Government itle 2, section 7293.8, subdivision (g) reasonable accommodation ia Code of Regulations, title 2,
42. Although PLAINTIFF provided multiple notices pertaining to her disatengage in a good faith interactive process to the extent needed to communic DEFENDANT believed business necessity required that the parameters of DEFENDANT did not discuss the nature and extent of PLAINTIFF's healt recommendation of her health care providers, the extent and underlying me accommodation, and the need for future accommodation as well as other in in the Unites States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's "Enforce Accommodation and Undue Hardship Under the Americans With Disabilitic Legislature in Government Code section 12926.1, subdivision (e). DEFENDINTERAL TOTAL COMMISSION (e). DEFENDING TOTAL COMMISSION (e).	cate to PLAINTIFF that the accommodation be reassessed. h condition, the advice and dical necessity of the apportant areas of inquiry recognized cement Guidance: Reasonable es Act" noted by the California DANT's obligation to engage in the NTIFF. Since DEFENDANT failed apployer in determining reasonable on 12940, subdivision (n)
43. DEFENDANT's discriminatory conduct was a substantial factor causing special damages including economic damages and non-economic damages in according to proof at trial. 44. As an actual and proximate result of the aforementioned violations, PLA amount according to proof, but in an amount in excess of the jurisdiction of a "affirmative relief" or "prospective relief" as defined by Government Code see 45. As an actual and proximate result of DEFENDANT's unlawful conduct, benefits, and other out of pocket expenses. 46. As an actual and proximate result of the aforementioned acts of DEFEND mentally upset, distressed, and aggravated. PLAINTIFF claims general damages in an amount according to proof at time of trial. 47. The above-described actions were perpetrated and/or ratified by a managinal distression.	In excess of this court's jurisdiction INTIFF has been harmed in an this court. PLAINTIFF also seeks section 12926, subdivision (a). PLAINTIFF has lost wages, DANT, PLAINTIFF has become ages for mental and emotional
PLAINTIFF's rights. Further, said actions were despicable in character and values in a sum sufficient to punish and deter DEFENDANT's future conductive WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF prays for judgment as hereinafter set for	reckless disregard of warrant the imposition of punitive uct. th.
(If the item that this Attachment concerns is made under penalty of perjury, all statements in the Attachment are made under penalty of perjury.)	ris Page 7 of 10

SHORT TITLE:	MC-025	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	CASE NUMBER:	
BRANCH v. THE PERMANENTE MEDICAL GROUP, INC.; et al.		
ATTACHMENT (Number):	8	

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION - Defamation

- 48. PLAINTIFF incorporates the allegations contained in the above paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.
- 49. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes that DEFENDANT and its agents and employees, by the above-described acts, conspired to, and in fact, did negligently, recklessly, and/or intentionally cause external publications of defamation, of and concerning PLAINTIFF, to third persons and to the community. These false and defamatory statements included express and implied statements that PLAINTIFF was an incompetent nurse and that her incompetence as a nurse had put patients at risk. These and other similar false statements expressly and impliedly stated that PLAINTIFF was dishonest and unethical.
- 50. While the precise dates of these publications are not known to PLAINTIFF, except as herein alleged, these publications were made on or after October 15, 2013, and were made to employees of DEFENDANT, and recipients in the community. PLAINTIFF hereby seeks damages for these publications and all foreseeable republications discovered up to the time of trial.
- 51. During the above-described time-frame, DEFENDANT and its agents and employees conspired to, and in fact, did negligently, recklessly, and/or intentionally cause excessive and unsolicited publication of defamation, of and concerning PLAINTIFF, to third persons, who had no need or desire to know. Those third person(s) to whom DEFENDANT published this defamation are believed to include, but are not limited to, other agents and employees of DEFENDANT, and the community, all of whom are known to DEFENDANT, and its agents and employees, but unknown at this time to PLAINTIFF.
- 52. The defamatory publications consisted of knowingly false and unprivileged communications, tending directly to injure PLAINTIFF and PLAINTIFF's personal, business, and professional reputation.
- 53. PLAINTIFF is informed, believes and fears that these false and defamatory per se statements will continue to be published by DEFENDANT and will be foreseeably republished by their recipients, all to the ongoing harm and injury to PLAINTIFF is business, professional, and personal reputations. PLAINTIFF also seeks redress in this action for all foreseeable republications, including her own compelled self-publication of these defamatory statements.
- 54. The defamatory meaning of all of the above-described false and defamatory statements and their reference to PLAINTIFF, were understood by these above-referenced third person recipients and other members of the community who are known to DEFENDANT, and its agents and employees, but unknown to PLAINTIFF at this time.
- 55. None of DEFENDANT's defamatory publications against PLAINTIFF referenced above are true.

(If the item that this Attachment concerns is made under penalty of perjury, all statements in this Attachment are made under penalty of perjury.)

Page <u>8</u> of <u>10</u>

SHORT TITLE: BRANCH v. THE PERMANENTE MEDICAL GROUP, INC.; et al.	CASE NUMBER:	MC-025
ATTACHMENT (Number):	9	
(This Attachment may be used with any Judicial Cou	uncil form.)	
EIGHT CAUSE OF ACTION – Defamation (CO	NTINUED)	

- 56. The above defamatory statements were understood as assertions of fact, and not as opinion.
- 57. Each of these false defamatory per se publications (as set forth above) were negligently, recklessly, and intentionally published in a manner equaling malice and abuse of any alleged conditional privilege (which PLAINTIFF denies existed), since the publications, and each of them, were made with hatred, ill will, and an intent to vex, harass, annoy, and injure PLAINTIFF in order to justify the illegal and cruel actions of DEFENDANT, and its agents and employees, to cause further damage to PLAINTIFF's professional and personal reputation, and to cause her to be wrongfully terminated.
- 58. DEFENDANT published these statements knowing them to be false and unsubstantiated by any independent investigation.
- 59. The above complained-of publications by DEFENDANT, and its agents were made with hatred and ill will towards PLAINTIFF and the design and intent to injure PLAINTIFF, PLAINTIFF's good name, her reputation, employment and employability. DEFENDANT and its agents published these statements, not with an intent to protect any interest intended to be protected by any privilege, but with negligence, recklessness and/or an intent to injure PLAINTIFF and destroy her reputation.
- 60. As a result of the publication and republication of these defamatory statements by DEFENDANT, and its agents, PLAINTIFF has suffered injury to her personal, business and professional reputation including suffering embarrassment, humiliation, severe embarrass, shunning, anguish, fear, loss of employment, and employability, and significant economic loss in the form of lost wages and future earnings, all to PLAINTIFF's economic, emotional, and general damage in an amount according to proof.
- 61. DEFENDANT committed the acts alleged herein recklessly, maliciously, fraudulently, and oppressively, with the wrongful intention of injuring PLAINTIFF, for an improper and evil motive amounting to malice (as described above), and which abused and/or prevented the existence of any conditional privilege, which in fact did not exist, and with a reckless and conscious disregard of PLAINTIFF's rights. All actions of DEFENDANT, and its agents and employees, herein alleged were perpetrated and/or ratified by a managing agent(s) or officer(s) of DEFENDANT.

WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF prays for judgment as hereinafter set forth.

(If the item that this Attachment concerns is made under penalty of perjury, all statements in this Attachment are made under penalty of perjury.)

Page 9 of 10

SHORT TITLE: BRANCH v. THE PERMANENTE MEDICAL GROUP, INC.; et al.	CASE NUMBER:
ATTACHMENT (Number):	10

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION - Wrongful Termination in Violation of Public Policy

- 62. PLAINTIFF incorporates the allegations contained in the above paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.
- 63. It is against the public policy of the State of California to terminate an employee on account of that employee's opposition to practices prohibited by state or federal law or the state or federal constitution.
- 64. DEFENDANT's termination of PLAINTIFF based upon, among other things, PLAINTIFF having complained about having been denied promotions and having been subjected to unwarranted discipline, and having exercised her right to take FMLA/CFRA medical leave for work-related stress caused by that discriminatory and retaliatory behavior, violated important public policies as embodied and codified in, inter alia, Government Code section 12940, et seq. and Government Code section 12945.2, California Code of Regulations, title 2, sections 7287.6, 7287.7, 7287.8, 7291.6, 7293.7, 7293.9, subdivision (a), 7295.0 and the California Constitution.
- 65. PLAINTIFF alleges that DEFENDANT's termination of her employment on or around October 15, 2013, was a retaliatory act in violation of the FEHA that was motivated, at least in part, by PLAINTIFF having exercised her right to take FMLA/CFRA medical leave for work-related stress caused by DEFENDANT's above-described discriminatory and retaliatory behavior.
- 66. DEFENDANT's discriminatory and retaliatory conduct was a substantial factor causing PLAINTIFF to suffer economic damages and non-economic damages in excess of this court's jurisdiction according to proof at trial.
- 67. As an actual and proximate result of the aforementioned violations, PLAINTIFF has been harmed in an amount according to proof, but in an amount in excess of the jurisdiction of this Court.
- 68. The above-described actions were perpetrated and/or ratified by a managing agent(s) or officer(s) of DEFENDANT. These acts were done with malice, fraud, oppression, and in reckless disregard of PLAINTIFF's rights. Further, said actions were despicable in character and warrant the imposition of punitive damages in a sum sufficient to punish and deter DEFENDANT's future conduct.

WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF prays for judgment as hereinafter set forth.

(If the item that this Attachment concerns is made under penalty of perjury, all statements in this Attachment are made under penalty of perjury.)

Page 10 of 10